

THE ROYAL
MARTYR'S TRIUMPH:
OR, THE
FANATICK DISCOVER'D.
BEING AN
A N A L Y S I S
OF A
SCANDALOUS LIBEL,
ENTITLED,
The Jesuit Unmask'd.

Attendite vero a falsis Prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in Vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt Lupi rapaces— a Fructibus Eorum cognoscetis Eos. Matt. Cap. 7. v. 15, 16.

By the AUTHOR of the ALCHEMIST,

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by C. Smith, at the *Blue Ball*,
in *Holyday-Yard*, *St. Dunstons Lane*; and at the
Pamphlet Shops of *London* and *Westminster*.

MDCCXXXVII. [Price 6d.]



THE ROYAL
MARTYR'S TRIUMPH:
OR, THE
FANATICK DISCOVER'D, &c.



HE Inveteracy of the *Fanatick*, against the Illustrious House of the STUARTS, has circulated with their Blood, since that *Sanglante* Tragedy, which did put a Period to the glorious Life of their Sovereign, and will be perpetuated among them from Generation to Generation, as the original Sin among *Adam's* Children.

THE *most worthy Author* of the Pamphlet now before me, whom I suppose to have learned Divinity in the Dust of some Cheesmonger's, or Soap-boiler's Shop, and to be the Offspring of those cruel Monsters, who dy'd their sacrilegious Hands in the sacred Blood of their natural and legitimate Sovereign, moved by the same evil Spirit, which induced his barbarous Ancestors to perpetrate that Regicide, abhorred even by the *Turks* and most Salvage Nations, can't bear seeing the Church of *England* cloathing herself with Sackcloth and Fast-

ing, for the Expiation of a Crime, in which she had no hand ; without ridiculing in the Excess of his Rage, a Fast ordained, and authorized, by the *Legislature* itself.

THE *Fanatick*, following the Example of all the *Seſtaries*, his Brethren, chooſes for his wicked Purpose, a number of Paſſages out of the Scripture, miſapply'd, and miſinterpreted ; taking one for his Text out of *Iſaiab*, which means nothing leſs than what he pretends ; the Prophet ſhowing only in that Chapter, the difference betwixt a counterfeit Faſt, and a true and ſincere one, as it plainly appears by the Argument of the ſaid Chapter, and by the following Verſes: *Is it ſuch Faſt as I have choſen ? A Day for a Man to afflict his Soul ? Is it to bow down his Head as a Bull-Ruſh, and to ſpread Sackcloth and Buſhes under him ? Wilt thou call this a Faſt, and an acceptable Day to the Lord ? c. viii. v. 5.* And again, ver. 6. *Is not this the Faſt which I have choſen ? To looſe the Bands of Wickedneſs, to undo the heavy Burthens, and to let the Oppreſſed go free, and that you break every Yoke, &c. &c.*

LET any impartial Man judge, how ſuch Paſſages can ſerve the Turn of our *Puritan*, and what Inferences he can draw from them againſt our Faſt of the Thirtieth of *January* ? unleſs it is to let us underſtand, that the Crime which has been the Occaſion thereof, was ſo black, that it ſhould be buried in an eternal Oblivion. But how can we ſuſpect ſuch to be the Intention of our *illiterate Author*, while he is endeavouring to juſtify the Atrocity of the Crime, and calls another Author blaſphemous, and infamous, for aſſerting, that the Murderers of *King Charles the Firſt*, were leſs excuſable than thoſe that put *Chriſt* to Death ; which Aſſertion, far from being blaſphemous, can be ſupported by the following undeniable Proofs.

I wou'd

I wou'd ask my *Enthusiast*, whether the Crucifixion of Christ, had not been decreed in the unsearchable Council of the Holy Trinity, as soon as the Incarnation of the Second Person, as the only Means, through which the great Mystery of our Redemption was to be accomplish'd? That sacred Decree, being once supposed, I would ask him again, whether it was possible (the Almighty admitting of no Mutability, nor Variation in his Judgment) to operate it otherwise? Let me ask him for the third time, whether the *Jews* had ever consented to be Instruments to the Passion of Christ, if they had not been blinded by God? *Non impariando malitiam sed denegando Gratiam*, says St. *Augustin*; and, whether they had known that *Jesus Christ*, reputed among them to be the Son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, was in reality the *Messiah* promised to their Fathers? Let the *Fanatick* answer, if such Blindness, was not a sort of Excuse for the *Jews*; and if it could be with any other View, that Christ asked his Father to forgive them; *Pater ignosce illis quia nesciunt quid faciunt*.

THE *Fanatick* must not mistake me in this place, for I don't pretend to make a Comparison between our Saviour, who by the Hippostatick Union, was both God and Man, and a simple Man, though a Prince, as was King *Charles the First*; for I agree that the Crime increases in Enormity, one Proportion of the Dignity of the Object offended; neither does the Question depend upon that Comparison, which can't be, *a finito, ad infinitum*; but in the nature of the Crime abstracted from its Object. All Laws both divine and human, allow that, *ignorantia invincibilis excusat a peccato*: no body being so unreasonable as to believe, that a Man who kills a Prince, without knowing him for such, is equally guilty with one who does it knowingly. Besides, Christ preach-

ed

ed a Doctrine, which did appear to the carnal *Jews* (who minded nothing, but *Littera quæ occidit*) quite different from the Law of *Moses*, which supposed Crime was then punishable with Death; and that was another Excuse, bad as it was, which could have pleaded in their Favour: But, says the *Fanatick*, the *Jews* had the Prophecies before them, where they could have found all which had been foretold of the *Messiah*; but they wanted the Grace, without which, the Prophecies were to them, as a Looking-Glass is to a blind Man.

OUR pitiful Pamphlet Writer, in this Place fights against his own Shadow, and spends his *Mechanick Divinity* to no purpose, by endeavouring to prove, what we won't deny; that the Crime of the *Jews* in putting Christ to death, was atrocious, and that the Prayer of our Blessed Saviour could not render them less criminal, neither had the Prayer of King *Charles* on such an Occasion, or his Forgiveness, render'd the Regicides innocent; but we insist upon the absolute Necessity of that Crucifixion, and the Ignorance, without which it had never been effected; which Ignorance for want of being rightly understood by our ignorant *Divine*, inflames his fanatick Zeal, and forces him to fall foul of the *Roman Catholicks*, and to load them with vile Aspersions, not at all to the purpose. But how could the Sectaries spit their Venom otherwise? Have they not always follow'd the same Practice, when too closely pursued by their Adversaries.

'Tis an impudent Falshood of our *Pamphlet Writer*, to pretend, that there is a parcel of People in the World, that place a great deal of Merit in Ignorance, since there is no such People to be found, unless it is the *Mahometans*, or the *Sectaries* themselves, who prefer their own Light and Judgement,

to

to the Decision of the Church, and to the Explanations, or Interpretations of the Scripture, made by those, trained up from their Infancy in the Study of the Divine Mysteries of the Christian Religion : Who is most guilty of a *voluntary Ignorance*, he, that's illiterate, and prefers his own Opinion, to that of a whole Body of learned Men, who never deliver it but after a mature Deliberation ; or he, that's conscious of his own Frailty, submits his Judgment to their Decision ? He, that by an insupportable Pride, thinks himself above all Instruction ; or he that wants it, and is willing of being instructed ? Who is to be thought the most *Ignorant*, he, that follows the Opinion of Men, more learned than himself ; or he, that relies entirely upon his own Opinion ? For this is the Case of our *Pamphlet Writer* ; and really, to write otherwise, wou'd prove very detrimental to the *Anarchy*, which his holy Brethren have endeavour'd to introduce into the Sanctuary.

I'LL allow that this is a Digression foreign to our Subject, but I hope I shall have the Liberty of making one in this Place, in Defence of the Truth, as well as our *Fanatick*, for the Assertion of two or three Falshoods, of which the following is an abominable one, *viz.* That *any Congregation which acknowledge Christ for their Saviour, would have canonized the infamous Murderers of Christ, under Pretence of their Ignorance.* Sure this is a monstrous Blasphemy, which cannot but be detested by every body else, but *Cromwel's Saints* : The Church, which the *Fanatick* means, having conceived such an Abhorrence of that heinous Crime, that she never mentions the *Jews* in her Prayers throughout the whole Year, save *Good Friday*, when she calls them perfidious, *Et pro perfidis Judæis*, &c. far from excusing their *Ignorance*, in the Sense of our
ignorant

ignorant Divine, who maketh his ignorant Congregation believe it.

I would ask our *Enthusiast*, if he knows the Signification of that Word *Certificate*? it appearing by his Discourse, that he is quite a Stranger to it; for if any body was to give a *Certificate* to a Man, to excuse him of a Crime committed thro' Ignorance, the Ignorance alledged in the *Certificate* as an Excuse, would not render him guiltless, neither has it the Vertue to operate the Conversion of the Guilty; to pretend likewise, that such Ignorance was not a sort of Excuse for the *Jews*, is blasphemously arraigning the Veracity of Christ himself, who thought it so; otherwise, he had never utter'd these Words, *Pater ignosce illis nesciunt enim quid faciunt*; and consequently, it might be justly said, that such Prayer was a more advantageous *Certificate* for the *Jews*, than if Christ had contented himself with saying, *Simpliciter, ignosce illis*, without giving any Reason for it; the Equity of which Reason, cannot doubtless be revoked, since pronounced by *Truth* itself; but, says our *Fanatick*, Compassion and Forgiveness are two great Attributes of the Sons of God. But he must likewise confess that *Truth* is as great as either of them, and that he could as well have forgiven them, without mentioning that Excuse, if their Ignorance had been inexcusable; for if otherwise, he had render'd himself guilty of a Falshood, which is incompatiable with the Divinity.

Such *blasphemous Philosophy* is certainly insupportable: Let's hear how he goes on; *They know not what they do, don't agree at all*, says he, *with the Character of the High Priest, and Sandherim; for when Judas' Remorse had led him to return the Money which they had given to betray his Master, notwithstanding, he passionately declared his Master's Innocency,*

Innocency, and his own Guilt, yet they bid him look to that—and proceeded to seek for false Witnesses against Jesus, and actually did stubborn Witness.

By our *Fanatick's* pretending, that *they knew not what they did*, don't agree with the Character of the *High Priest* and the *Sandherim* ; he most questions the Candour of the *Evangelist*, who relates the History of his *Passion* ; and gives impiously the *Lye* to *Christ* ; for there is no *Medium* to choose betwixt the Positions, which both are erroneous and blasphemous. However, I deny that those Expressions of *Christ*, do not agree with the Character of the *Sanherim* ; since that Council had no other Ideas of the *Messiah*, than those of Grandeur, Power, and Magnificence, which could not be found in the obscure Life of *Christ* ; the *Sandherim*, like the *Sectaries*, minding nothing but the literal Sense of the Law : The *Messiah* had been foretold by the Prophets, as the Son of *David*, and Heir to his Throne ; he was to break the Chains of *Israel*, and restore it to its entire Liberty ; which had no likelihood of being performed by *Jesus*, a Man in all Appearance without Power, Wealth, or Authority ; a Man who had never laid Claim to the Throne of his Ancestors, and a Man who had himself encouraged the paying the Tribute to *Cæsar* : How cou'd then the *Sandherim* have believed such Man to be the Son of God ? and had they not on the contrary, all the apparent Reasons to condemn him as an Innovator, that did preach a Doctrine contrary to the Law of *Moses* ; they might have interpreted the Prophecies, and understood them in a more spiritual Sense ? but they could not do it without the Assistance of other Grace, which they had not ; so can the *Sectaries* understand better, all the Passages of the Scripture, which mention a *Hierarchy* and *Episcopacy* in the Church, but they refuse to do it :
Christ

Christ was so far from affecting a Sovereign Authority, that he declared in his Examination before *Pilate*, that his Kingdom was not of this World; and the Witnesses suborned against him, are called false Witnesses by the *Evangelist*, for accusing *Jesus* of having called himself *King of the Jews*. *Pilate* himself, (altho' he thought him innocent) did not however believe that he laid any Claim to a Temporal Kingdom; seeing plainly that all the Rage of the *Sandherim* against him, proceeded only, from his preaching a Doctrine which condemned their Conduct.

I won't pretend to infer from all this, that the Ignorance of the *Jews* was an invincible one, (for then they had been entirely guiltless) since they wanted no means of Conviction; but as we have already observed, they minded no more then, than they do at present, the literal Sense of the Law, wanting besides, a special Grace to discover the spiritual one; which Grace they did not ask for. Every-body will allow, that if we were to take all the Prophecies, which mention the coming of the *Messiah*, in their literal Sense, Christ could not have been thought the Son of God; and if there is some, which are clearer upon that Subject than others, why should our *Fanatick* find Fault in the *Jews*, for giving a false Interpretation to it, more than in his Brethren, for doing the same to all the most clear Passages of the Scripture, relating to the *Church*, *Hierarchy*, *Episcopacy*, *Ordination*, &c.

OUR *Fanatick*, tho' very ignorant himself, won't nevertheless admit of any Ignorance being excusable, arraigning even the Apostle *St. Paul*, for alledging it such in himself, when he persecuted the *Christians*, and to serve his wicked purpose, he gives a false Interpretation to the Words of the Apostle, chusing rather to make bad *English* of it, than to give it
its

its true and natural Sense; so much he is over-
 awed by his *Master Satan*: “The Greek Conjun-
 ction, *et*, which is translated, may as well, says
 he, be translated as touching that being of Opi-
 nion, that the Apostle’s Sense will appear more
 perfect, if we read it thus, *I was so and so wick-*
ed, but I obtained Mercy as touching that I did
it ignorantly, and in unbelief.”—— I would not
 have the Reader think, that our *Puritan*, gives
 this his own spurious Interpretation to the Words
 of the Apostle, with the Intention only of lessening
 the Excuse of *St. Paul*, for then he would be
 very ignorant indeed? but he does it only to give
 us a Hint of his *School Learning*, and to let us
 know that he understands *Greek*; for in fact, *because*,
 or touching that, doth not change the Sense of
 the Sentence; *Ignorance* remaining still for an Ex-
 cuse of the Apostle’s Persecution against the Chri-
 stians. *But however*, continues the *Fanatick*, (for
 fear as I suppose of a Censure) *St. Paul was not so*
wicked a Sinner as he represented himself to be; de-
 signing by that to bring him into his Fraternity
 for a Lawyer. ’Tis true, that *St. Paul* had not im-
 brued his Hands in Christ’s Blood, but he had per-
 secuted him in his Members, which was equally
 wicked; and was going to *Rome* for a more ex-
 tensive Power, when he was stopt on the Road of
Damascus by a Voice, who ask’d him, *Saule, Saule,*
quid me persequeris? and when he ask’d the Voice
 who he was, it answer’d him, *Ego sum Christus*
quem tu persequeris; thereby intimating to him,
 that he was equally guilty with the *Jews*, who had
 crucified *Jesus*: But my *Gentleman*, looks upon all
 other Crimes, besides the Crucifixion, as mere
 Trifles; neither do I believe, that *he* would think
 himself guilty in murdering Christ, if he was to

return upon Earth, and the *Oliverian*, cou'd think in doing it, to assert the *Good Old Cause*.

I leave here our *Fanatick*, quoting a vast number of false, and misinterpreted Passages, (because used to it when in his *Tub*, to give a grand Idea of his Learning to his Female Hearers, and have their Approbation in their *Sabbatical* Visits, of being a very fine Man) to examine him upon the Point in question, and expose him to the World in his true Light, as an Apologist of the Murder of our glorious Martyr; for this is the Point which touches him to the quick: Since any body might have excused the *Jews*, as much and as long as he would, and even blasphemed our divine Saviour, more than even the *Sandherim* did, before the *Puritan* had thought it worth while to take any Notice of it, provided the Regicides of King *Charles* had been left untouched; but it is not in his Nature to be silent upon a Subject, which arraigns his whole Brotherhood, and has made them detested and abhorred by all the World.

“ I profess, says he, that I am puzzled, what
 “ People mean by styling King *Charles* a natural
 “ King, for Nature introduces us into the World
 “ with an Equality of Power, and Right of Do-
 “ minion; and mature Men, consider'd as in a
 “ State of Nature, have a perfect Freedom to or-
 “ der their Actions, and dispose of their distinct
 “ Propriety, without depending on the Will of
 “ any other.” This whole Page. and part of the
 following, is all to the same purpose, *viz.* to prove
 the Lawfulness of Anarchy, and that we were all
 born with an Equality of Power, without Subordi-
 nation; so that no body has a natural Right to the
 Succession of his Father's Estate, being an Usurpa-
 tion to claim it; all others being born as free, are
 reckoned

reckoned by our *Enthusiast*, equally lawful and legitimate Heirs to it; and may if they please, and when they please, turn us out at the Door; for it would be very great injustice to pretend, that the Right of Succession is better asserted in the Subject than in their Sovereign, and that our Tenants are more obliged to pay their Rents, than we are to obey our King, since the Enjoyment of our Possessions would be very precarious, if not upheld by his Authority; our being refractory to his Orders, being very likely to prove a very bad Example, for our Vassals doing the same to us.

However, to solve more clearly the important Question, I would ask the *Pamphlet Writer*, if King *Charles the First*, was not the Son by Nature and not by Adoption, of King *James the First*? If King *James the First* was not King of *England*, declared to be so, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Will by Right of Inheritance, and not by the Choice of the People? I'll ask him further, if that hereditary Kingdom, devolving, at King *James's* Death, to his legitimate Son King *Charles the First*, was not then a natural Right, as being the Succession of a Son to his Father's Estate? Were not the Children of the Slaves among the *Romans* called natural Slaves.

As for his Assertion, that Nature introduces us unto the World with an Equality of Power; I deny it utterly as a monstrous *Paradox*, the *Author* of which deserves to be severely punished; for pretending to introduce thereby, a Confusion tending to the entire Destruction of the human Kind. Even from the Beginning, the Men were not born with an Equality of Power, since there was a Subordination of the two Children of *Adam*; the Right of Primogeniture having been asserted from the Beginning; there has been Masters and Servants from the Beginning; Poor and Rich from the Beginning;

Chiefs of Families, and of Tribes from the Beginning. God Almighty, who alone, is the absolute Master of all created Beings, would not so much as deprive *Eſau* of his *Birth-Right*; before he had ſold it himſelf to his Brother *Jacob*: From which Premises I draw the following Concluſion, that King *Charles* was the natural King of the Regicides, as being by Nature legitimate and true Heir to the Eſtate of his Father; which Eſtate was the Kingdom of *England*, and which could not be lawfully taken from him, upon any Pretence whatever. But ſuppoſe (which Suppoſition is falſe) he had had no other Right to the Crown, but the free Conſent of the People; could that have entitled them to judge and condemn him as a Criminal, and authorized them to take off his Head? Has it ever been known ſince the Beginning of Monarchy, that a Prince was ſubject to the penal Laws? and is it not a Maxim of the Law itſelf, that they are ſubject to it, only *quoad directionem, ſed non quoad Coactionem*? and if even it was otherwiſe, could the Revolt of a few Fanaticks, have been taken for the Conſent of the whole Nation? The Nobility was fled, the rebellious Rable had got the upper Hand, and Fanatiſm, had polluted the Sanctuary of the living God; which was filled then with Thives and Murderers.

THE Pamphlet Writer objects, that natural Right ſuppoſed King *Charles* had forfeited that Right, by trampling upon the Liberties and Priviledges of the People. And by violating his Coronation Oaths; which Poſition he proves in the following Manner.

FIRST, with ſuppoſing that King *Charles*, aimed at the total Deſtruction of the Proteſtant Religion; in Writing thus to *Pope Gregory the XVth.* upon the Appearance of his Alliance with the Infanta of
Spain;

Spain; That he had always been far from encouraging Novelties, or to be Partisan of any Faction against the Catholick Apostolick and Roman Religion; which Supposition, if ever so true, could infer nothing against King Charles; who was at the Time of the Writing that Letter, but Prince of Wales, and could not consequently have violated an Oath, which he had not yet taken. Neither had it been a Crime in him, to declare that he, was far from encouraging Novelties, since he could not do it, even, in encouraging the Protestant Religion, which is taught by its Professors to be as ancient as the Apostles Time. Clearing himself from being Partisan of Faction, has nothing in it but what is very agreeable to the Spirit of the Gospel; which is a Spirit of Temperance, Humility, and Peace, quite opposite to that of Faction, which breaths nothing but Trouble and Confusion; and consequently more to be abhor'd by a Prince, who is obliged to set a good Example, then by his Subjects. But since that Letter to Gregory the Vth, is taken by many for Apocryphal, this Supposition of our Fanaticks, is as false as all his others. Besides, I don't see why King Charles had been a Tyrant, if even he had attempted any thing against the Religion established in the Land? For, will any Protestant say, that King Henry the VIIIth, was a Tyrant for building the Protestant Church upou the Ruin of that of Rome? but King Charles persisting and dying in the Protestant Religion, takes of all Suspicion of that kind; which was only made Use of by the Rebels, for a Pretence to come easier at his Sacred Head.

The Pamphlet Writer must not think, that by clearing in this Place King Charles of the Tyranny he accuses him of, I suppose Tyranny, to be a reasonable Pretence for depriving a King of his

his Throne ; for I look upon a Tyrant, as upon a young Prince in his Minority, who is incapable of governing by himself, on account of his tender Years, his want of Knowledge, and Experience ; and as it would be the greatest Injustice in the Subjects of such a Prince to deprive him of his Dominions, and transfer them to another, so the same might be said of a Tyrant : The *Turks* have often deposed their Emperor, but they have always filled his Place by a Successor the nearest in Blood, never punishing the Son for the Crime of his Father.

OUR *honest Asserter* of the good old Cause, makes another *Quære* to the same Purpose, to lengthen, as I suppose, his spurious Jargon, and make it worth two-pence more. “ Now I would ask, says he, in what View King *Charles* could, with any Propriety, be called the natural King of the Regicides ? ” To which Question I have given already, I hope, a satisfactory Answer, in proving his unquestionable Right to the Kingdom. I must confess, that if the Nation had but just then begun to unite into a Society, and to put itself under his Government, (as the *Fanatick* would persuade those, who are ignorant enough to believe him) and if the Kingdom of *England* had been an elective one, as that of *Poland*, the Right of King *Charles* had not been a natural Right ; but since it was but a Continuation of the Power, which his glorious Ancestors had acquir’d over the Nation, which Nation was indebted to them for the most part of its Priviledges ; he was undoubtedly the natural King of the *Regicides* ; and all Assertions to the contrary, are *Erroneous* and *Anarchicall*.

THE *Oliverian* little cares how lame his Comparisons are, provided, they lead him to what he aims at ; for he pretends to compare a King to a common Judge, who without question, may be opposed as
any

any other Man, when he exceeds the Power given him by the Law; but even that simple Judge, can he be deposed by the People alone, and would it not be a Crime punishable, to pull him down from his Seat and divest him of his Authority, without the Intervention of the Prince, whose Person he represents, and who alone has the Power to do it, without the Advice of his Subjects? Besides, the Power of a Judge, has no other Foundation, than *beneficium Principis*; and is consequently, very different from the hereditary Right of a King.

BUT, objects again our *Enthusiast*, "King Charles" being a Tyrant, King James his Father in his "Speech to the Parliament, in 1609, asserted that "a King governing in a settled Kingdom, ceases "to be a King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as "soon as leaves off to rule according to his Laws." But does King James say, that a Tyrant loses his Right to the Kingdom by his Tyranny? that he should be arraigned as the most infamous Criminal, and condemned to the last Supplice, by a Pack of Knaves, who had no Authority, neither by Right or Concession, but what they had usurp'd themselves?

ANOTHER mark of King Charles's Tyranny, is (if we believe the *Enthusiast*) his Marriage with *Henrietta Maria* of France, and allowing her a Chapel at *Somerset-House*, an Article stipulated in the Contract of Marriage of that Princess, before the Celebration of it, and which King Charles cou'd not have infringed, without violating his Oaths; besides, it had been the greatest Injustice in that Prince, to refuse his Queen a Privilege which was granted to the greatest Scoundrels in the Kingdom; since even the *Fanatics* enjoy'd it, and those who were not Christians; but however, the King was willing to take off the least subject of Complaint,
that

that he granted every Particular ask'd by the Parliament, in relation to the putting a Barrier to the Growth of Popery, giving his Royal Assent to all Acts made against the *Papists*, as it appears by the Journals of Both Houses, at those critical Times; depriving even the Queen his Consort of her most faithful Servants, to please the Disaffected to his Government, which was a thing impossible.

As for that monstrous Romance, of the Penance imposed on the Queen, to go barefoot to *Tyburn*, it is such an abominable Falshood, that I am certain that the *Fanatick* who relates it, don't believe it himself.

KING *Charles's* lending his Ships to the King of *France*, against the poor Protestant *Rochellers*, as the *Fanatick* is pleased to call his Brethren in Iniquity; those poor innocent Babes of Grace, whose charitable Zeal had so often led them to draw their Sword, in Defence of their new-invented *Calvinian* Faith, when King *Jesus*, whom they pretended to choose for their only King, on purpose to govern under him, wanted so much a Place to rest his Sacred Head, who used to say when on Earth, that his Kingdom was not of this World, and that, *qui ferit gladio, gladio peribit*; King *Charles* lending his Ships, as the *Fanatick* observes, is another strong Proof of his Tyranny, when he must be conscious himself, that the Religion had the least to do in that Affair, being only an Excuse for the Parliament's finding Fault with the Conduct of the unhappy Prince; besides, Religion a part, it was the Interest of the Parliament to involve the Kingdom of *France* in a Civil War, the better to excuse their cruel Project, and hinder by those Means, the King of *France* from assisting King *Charles* during the Civil Wars.

BUT

BUT let make some few serious Reflections on the Equity and Impartiality of our *Oliverian*, in condemning King *Charles* for lending his Ships against the *Rochellers*, and the King of *France* for persecuting them ; when in the mean time he blames that King for his Toleration of the Romish Religion in *Ireland*. The *Fanatick* must certainly be an utter Stranger to the distributive Justice, or else he wou'd never attempt to deprive King *Charles's* Subjects of a Privilege, which he claims for his Brethren in a Foreign Country ; why should he accuse the King of *France* of Tyranny, for refusing the Liberty of Conscience to his Rebellious Subjects, and throw the same Aspersions on King *Charles the First*, for granting it to the *Papists* ; not one of those two Religions have been authorized by the Law in either Kingdom ; for *Hugonotism* was no more the reigning Religion in the Kingdom of *France* at that time, than was *Catholicity* in *England*. Perhaps the *Fanatick* will object, that *Hugonotism* being the purest Religion, had more Right to that Claim ; such no doubt, is the Opinion of the *Puritans*, but the *French* Nation thought otherwise ; and as it is allowed by all the Protestants, that every Man may follow his own Opinion in Religious Matters, the *French* could never be blamed for thinking the Roman Religion the best.

HOWEVER, Religion was the least Motive of that Toleration ; King *Charles* wanted Money which he could not get otherwise, then by imposing a Tax upon the *Papists* ; for when he ever made Application to his Parliament for it, there was always some new Grievances to redress, and the whole Session was often spent in frivolous Debates, and presenting Addresses, before his Majesty could have any satisfactory Answer from both Houses, which undutiful Delays used to put the King to his last
C shift,

shift, and force him to use extraordinary Means for raising Sums necessary to maintain the Glory of the Nation abroad, and to keep Peace and Quietness at home.

THE Declaration of both Houses, both filled with *Fanaticks*, prove nothing against King *Charles*, neither is it more just or reasonable by being set at large in *Rapin's* History; being himself noted for a Republican, whose Interest it was to blame ev'ry thing tending to Monarchy, altho' it don't appear by his Reflections, that he approved entirely the Conduct of the Disaffected Members; neither can we conclude by his Narrative, that he gave for granted that his Majesty was privy to the Massacre in *Ireland*, which he utterly deny'd to his last Breath.

" I cannot therefore but observe, says *Rapin*,
 " concerning this Declaration, that there are some
 " Articles, which seem very much aggravated;
 " and others from whence may be drawn Confe-
 " quences not so odious, as those, here, insinuated."

Rap. Vol. I. p. 493.

AGAIN, " It appears by this Manifesto, that
 " the Parliament, had little Regard for the King.
 " But besides the Animosity and Revenge, which
 " might enter into the Design of blackning his
 " Reputation, it is certain that Policy had no
 " small Share in it." From this, it might be in-
 ferr'd, that *Rapin*, tho' a Republican, could not
 justify the Proceedings of the Factious in the
 House of Commons, whose criminal ambitious
 Views, made them tempt all ways to usurp the Go-
 vernment upon their lawful Sovereign.

THE Queen's being privy to the Irish Butchery,
 is but a false Supposition of the Fanaticks of those
 Times, and related by our *Pamphlet Writer* for an
 incontestable Truth, the better to enrage the Na-
 tion

tion against the Religion she professed, for that Crime could never be proved upon her; and Father *D'Orleans*, who has wrote the History of the Revolutions in *England*, upon more authentick Memoirs than ever did *Rapin*, and with less Partiality, rejects that Letter supposed to be found in the *E.* of *Autrim's* Pocket, as a spurious and scandalous Libel, wrote by the Fanaticks themselves, with no other View, than to blacken the Reputation of the Queen.

WHY should King *Charles* have been debarred, for admitting into his Guards, or keeping in his Pay a Body of 3000 *Irish*, since they proved to be the best Troops he had against his rebellious Subjects; his fatal End had happen'd a great deal sooner, if he had entirely rely'd on the Fidelity of some of his *English* Friends, by whom he was ev'ry Day deserted, and at last quite forsaken; being very much to his Honour, that his Enemies could bring no other Charges upon him before impartial Judges.

THE Pharisaical Hypocrisy of the *Pamphlet Writer*, is umberable, when he brings for Proof of the Tyranny of King *Charles*, his tolerating Sports and Pastimes on a *Sunday*: The holy Man! sure, in his Opinion, plotting against the Life of a King, and studying nothing else but Destruction and Horror, which took then all the Time of his pious Ancestors, *Sundays* as well as *working Days*, were Deeds of Piety, if compared with the irregular Observance of the *Lord's Day*; following in that the Example of the *Jews*, who did find Fault with the Apostles forgetting to wash their Hands before their Meals, while at the same time, they themselves, violated the most essential Points of *Moses' Law*.

KING *Charles's* dissolving the Parliament, was nothing but what he had a Right to do as a King, following in that the Example of his Predecessors, especially, when he knew that they were acting contrary to the Nation's Interest and his own. The seizing the Papers, sealing the Closets, and imprisoning the Persons of the Lord *Kimbolton*, *Pim*, *Hambden*, *Daniel Hollis*, *Autbur Haslerig*, and *Stroud*, was an Act of Justice not severe enough, against such Sticklers and Disturbers of the Public Quietness, who deserved to be deliver'd to the Common Executioner for an Example, to deter others from doing the same, which Execution had infallibly prevented the Effusion of so much Blood, but as I have observed already, King *Charles* was too conscientious, and too meek a Prince for those difficult Days. I am surprized that the sanctify'd *Fanatick*, is not ashamed to bring those scandalous Fellows upon the Stage, some of whom had been long before stigmatized for other Crimes.

THE Pamphlet Writer cannot help showing his Ignorance throughout all his scandalous Libel, by pretending that *Jus Divinum*, is nothing else but the Anointing of the King, and that the Oil used in that Ceremony, is the only Foundation, *Juris Divini*; but I can inform him better, by telling him that a King, is King, *Jure Divino*, by being choosed by God for that eminent Office, and that the pouring of the Oil, is nothing else but a simple Ceremony; *fill thine Horn with Oil and go*, said God to *Samuel*, *I will send thee to Jesse the Bethle-mite, for I have provided me a King amongst his Sons*. This Choice of God, is *Jus Divinum*, which however has never been thought by any to have the Efficacy of rendring a King infallible; no more than the Ceremony of the *Inauguration*. Every honest Man will allow, that from that time, the
 Person

Person of a King, (being sacred) it is a Sacrilege punishable with the most infamous Death, to lay violent Hands upon him. The Example of *Aaron's* Sons, alledged by our *Entbusiast*, on the contrary, is out of the Question, since they were punished by God himself, for having violated the Law of their Office, and not by the *Israelites*. The very Quotation of the *Rebellious Villain*, for I have no Patience with him, that, *a Fire went from the Lord, and devoured them*, rise in Judgment against him; as well as the Example of *David*, whom he will have had spared *Saul's* Life twice, *on account only, that that Prince was both times asleep, or by Policy for fear of incurring the Displeasure of the People, or else because he knew that Saul had lost his Senses*; when *David* himself gave no other Reason for it, than that of *Saul's* being the *Lord's Anointed*; and that he punished the *Amalekite* who brought him his Head after the Battle of *Gilboa*, for, *stretching forth his Hand to destroy the Lord's Anointed*. But who would be presumptuous to question the Right of our *Fanatick*, giving what Sense he pleases to *David's* Words, when 'tis to serve his Ends.

Neither does he think himself obliged to deal with more Circumspection and Modesty, with the Apostle, for he would make us believe, that *St. Paul* don't recommend Passive Obedience, and Non-Resistance, in his Epistle to the *Romans* c. 13. But let us see how the Words of the Apostle agree with his Opinion. *Let every Soul be subject unto the higher Powers; for their is no Power but of God; the Powers that be, are ordained of God.*—*Who-so-ever therefore resists the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation,* (THIS IS A THUNDERBOLT FOR THE FANATICK).—*Wherefore ye must needs*
be

be subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake. Rom. 13. v. 1, 2, 5.

THE Pamphlet Writer, MENTITUR IMPUNE, when he asserts that the Apostle don't pretend that we are obliged to obey a Tyrant, for I would ask him what forced Interpretation he could give to such plain Terms, as are these, *obedite Præpositis vestris etiam discolis*. And when the *Israelites* ask'd for a King, did not the ALMIGHTY forewarn 'em, that a King would be a Tyrant, taking their Sons for his Servants, their Daughters for their Maids and Concubines, usurp their Fields and their Vineyards, IMPOSE HEAVY TAXES; and that they should cry out in that Day because of their King, and the Lord would not hear them in that Day. Which Promise God accomplished, in the Person of Saul, for tho' that Prince was reprov'd by him, and that he had chosen David for his Successor, he however left him to reign, 'till he fell by the hands of his Enemies; neither did ever David or any other *Israelite* make an Attempt upon his Sacred Life.

ANOTHER Mark of the Ignorance of our Pamphlet Writer is, his pretending that the Government of the *Israelites* under their Kings, was a Theocracy; The Jewish Government, quoth he, could never be intended as a Plan of Government to other Nations, it was truly a Theocracy; God was their immediate Governour: If such Government was a Theocracy, I'll ask him what was then the difference between such Government, and that under their Judges; and if God was their immediate Governour, how could the Jews have groaned under so much Oppression as they did, under Rehoboam, Achab, &c.?

Must I then, says our insinuating Fanatick, for fear of receiving Damnation to myself, not resist a Power or Authority, that itself opposes the Ordinance

of

of God the Fountain of all Power? We may oppose it with Decency, and as it becomes a Subject, by Remonstrances, Addresses, &c. but not by Force of Arms, or depriving a Sovereign of his Life, or of his Throne; for since our *Puritan* confesses that God is the Fountain of all Power, when he himself is pleased to say, *Per me Reges Regnant, Per me Principes imperant*, it belongs to no body else to deprive a King of his Authority, much less of his Sacred Life; *noli Tangere Christos meos*, says he again, in another Place; but however, how can he be a competent Judge of the Conduct of a King? and can it be said that the Crimes alledged against King *Charles the First*, were against the Law of God? which is the only Reason alledged by the *Oliverian*, for opposing a King. Suppose, even, that he had tolerated Popery, could such Toleration have been more against the Law of God, than that granted to all the Dissenters? Are not the *Roman Catholicks* baptised in the Name of the Holy Trinity? Have not they an *Hierarchy*, and an interrupted Succession from the Apostles, and from whence the *English* derives their Church, and consequently approved by her? Did the *English* Church find Fault with that Toleration, or rather the Secretaries, who had no manner of Right to do it, since they were no more then them, *pro bene placito*.

BUT to proceed with our *Enthusiast*; if *Rapin*, pretends that *Cromwell*, was the only Usurper he had met with that died a natural Death, that Author must be very ignorant of the History, or else he would have found a great many other Usurpers who have died a natural Death. *Pepin le Bref*, and *Huguo Capet*, in France died natural Deaths. Many Kings of the *Lombards*, and Usurpers, have died a natural Death. Besides, there are other Punishments for Usurpation than temporal ones, and God
has

has often chose in his Anger, Usurpers for Instruments of his Wrath, and to punish the Wickedness of Men. *Attila*, King of the *Huns*, who ravaged all *Italy*, was styled, *Flagellum Dei*.

I just observe, says the *Fanatick*, that *Oliver* died a natural Death—— but 'tis as remarkable, that neither King *Charles* nor his Favourite *Buckingham*, nor those other two Ministers, *Strafford* and *Laud*, did so; but he should have added, neither Christ or his Apostles did so; altho' most of their unjust Judges and Persecutors, died a natural Death; and therefore that infamous Usurper, dying a natural Death, is not a Reason that God approved his Usurpation, or of his taking off the Head of his Sovereign, which is certainly the most infamous Mark that ever was fixed on any Nation in the Universe, since the Murder of the Son of God; neither is the *Irish* Massacre to be compared to it, since it was only occasioned by an Animosity between two Parties of equal Rank and Dignity, whereof the Regicide of King *Charles* was perpetrated in cold Blood, and upon a Person who was God representative upon Earth, which makes the Difference; and not because consecrated by the *Episcopal Unction*.

I must agree with the *Pamphlet Writer*, that the Almighty has not made a great many particular Punishments of the Regicides, besides the few hanged, and others obliged to fly their Country; but he has made so general ones ever since, that the whole Nation has been, and is likely to be for ever in Trouble and Confusion, oppressed and enslaved. The Quotation out of *Jeremiah* proves nothing against it; for in that Chapter, the Prophet, Prophecies only the Restauration of *Israel* to its ancient Splendour, as it appears by the Argument of the Chapter; again *I will build thee and thou shalt be built, O Virgin of Israel, thou shalt again*
be

be adorned with thy Tabrets and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry. ch. xxxi. v. 4. for the Lord has redeemed Jacob and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. v. 11.

Which Blessing, will perhaps happen unto *England*, and the Regicide forgiven, when she has weeped as long as did *Israel*, then the Lord will say unto us, as to the *Israelites*, *Refrain thy Voice from weeping and thine Eyes from Tears*—— and it shall come to pass that like as I have watched over them, TO PLUCK UP, AND TO BREAK DOWN, AND TO THROW DOWN, and to destroy and to afflict; so will I watch over them, to build and to plant——in those Days they shall say no more, the Fathers have eaten a sour Grape, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge. *Idem. v. 16, 28, 29.* Which Promises of the Lord, were more than a moral Certainty, for the *Jews* that (being moved by their Tears and long Sufferances) he had at last, forgiven their Sins, and can't be extended to other Nations. For if God had from that time, took the Resolution of never visiting the Sins of the Fathers on their Sons, why should we be born still with the original Sin of *Adam*?

I won't pretend to say, that the Crime of *Cromwell*, *Ireton*, &c. should be imputed to their Descendants, if they are honest Men. But however, they can't be excused from detesting that Crime, since it is a Stain on their Family, which cannot be washed off; when on the contrary, their obduracy, in approving of that Crime, is a moral Sign, that it is not yet forgiven by the Almighty.

THE *Fanatick*, ends his scandalous Libel, as he begun it, by injurious Reflections on the ILLUSTRIOUS HOUSE OF THE STUARTS, which he taxes with *Pride*, *Ambition*, and a strong Disposition to rule absolutely and without Law. Sure he must

mistake the *Stuarts* for his Brethren, since those three abovementioned Vices, have always been the *Chraacteristicks* of the Sectaries, from the first fatal Moment, our Church had the Misfortune to be infected with that *devouring Plague*. For, was it Humility or Pride, which inspired a parcel of illiterate Fellows to reform the Christian World with Fire and Sword? Was it Ambition or Disinterestedness, which made them jealous of the Regal Power in all Parts of *Europe*, where they have been tolerated? Was it not Ambition that made them side with the *disaffected Princes* of the *House of France*, seated and fortified themselves in the strongest Places of the Kingdom, appear in Arms, fight a great many Battels, as those of *Jarnac*, *Moncontour*, &c.? forcing often their lawful and natural Prince to make disgraceful Capitulations, and shameful Treaties with them, of which, they were always the first Infringers, for they could never contain themselves within the Limits of any Agreement whatever, being always at work to extend their Priviledges further and further, 'till at last, the late King of *France* expelled them from the Kingdom, and in very good time for him, or else in all likelihood, he had been forced at the latter end of his Reign to shift for himself, as did some of his Neighbours; for it had been then impossible for him, to have withstood his domestick and foreign Enemies. Was the Christian Religion established that way? Did any Ecclesiastical Historian mention, that a Sword was drawn in her Defence against the Persecution of the Roman Emperors? Did the Christians borrow other Swords besides, their Pens, Prayers, and Tears, who had then as formidable Power to struggle against, as ever had the Fanaticks? What else but Ambition did engage the Sectaries to pry so narrowly into the Conduct

Conduct of King *Charles*? and if they wanted no other King but King *Jesus*, why did they endeavour to settle any other Kingdom but his own, which is not of this World, and which is promised only to those who have been persecuted and afflicted upon Earth. Would King *Jesus* have sat upon a Throne swimming in Blood, and usurped? Would he have chosen for his Ministers, the Profelytes of *Satan*; a pack of Thieves and Murderers, who could not bear being governed by others, because they wanted to be the only Rulers and Governours, choosing for their King an invisible one, whom, if visible, they wou'd have deposed (tho' the Son of God) if he had decreed any thing contrary to their Fanatical Zeal, arraign him, perhaps, for not being a TRUE PROTESTANT. For no body can deserve that Character from them, without following their Vices.

THEREFORE it is against the Interest of the Commonwealth, as well as of the Church, to give a full Career to the *Puritanism* in this Kingdom, since a King cannot sit easy upon his Throne, nor his Subjects be secured for a single Moment of their Peace and Quietness, as long as that horrid Monster will be allow'd to ramble, and spit his *deadly Venom thro' the Land*, which is the more dangerous because artfully disguised. Our Church had never no greater Enemies; for they not only ridicule the Fast of the Thirtieth of *January*, kept for a perpetual Remembrance of the Fall of one of her master Pillars, but they condemn likewise, all her other Ceremonies and Religious Observations, and even her *Orthodoxy*. I want no other Proof of it, than what happen'd in the Civil Wars, when her most holy Sanctuary, was made Stables for Horses, for no other Reason, because consecrated to the TRUE GOD, whose Ministers were forced to desert

the Service, for fear of being sacrificed upon his Sacred Altars. Then, were heard in Ramah Lamentations and bitter weeping; our holy Mother the Church, weeping for her Children, refused to be comforted, because they were not. The Sacred Roofs of our Temples echoed then nothing but Sighs and Groans, and the Praises of the Lord were no more celebrated, in *Tympano et Choro, in Organis bene Sonantibus*; 'till King Charles the Second, was restored to the Throne of his GLORIOUS MARTYRED FATHER. For then, the Souls of our Priests was satiated with Fatness, the Yoke was broken from off our Neck, our Bands were burst, and we were allowed to serve the Lord our God, and CHARLES our KING was raised up unto us; our Mourning was then turned into Joy, and we were made to rejoice from our Sorrow. Then the Land flowed with Milk and Honey, Chearfulness and Plenty reigned all over the Kingdom, Lucifer was once again chained in Hell, because the Conventicles of his Emissaries were shut up; but, alas, fortunate Days, happy Times, you are no more! *Fanatism* is as much encouraged at present as ever it was, and the worst is, that he endeavours to settle under the Throne, to shoot from thence with more Impunity her poison'd Arrows at the true Religion; but thou, Almighty King of Kings, be in these our new Days of Affliction, our Tower of Defence, against those our powerful Enemies, look once more from Heaven, O Divine Spouse, with a tender and compassionate Eye, on the Affliction of thy Spouse, our Holy Mother the Church, redress her Wrongs and be her Comforter; and as thou dost not desire the Death of a Sinner, but rather that he should repent and live; make shine to the Eyes of those voluntary Blinds, the *Fanaticks*, the precious Light of thy Divine Truth; change their obdurate Hearts
by

by the Efficacy of thy Grace, inflame it with the sacred Fire of *thy Charity*, so that they may love thee and their Neighbours; shut their Ears to the alluring and deceitful Discourses of their ignorant and barbarous Teachers, blind Guides, who never miss drawing them into Perdition; instruct them, O Lord! that we cannot repent too often and too long for a Crime, which deserves eternal Punishment. Make them know, that the glorious King they blaspheme against, was the best of Kings, both their Father and their King; and that if even he had been guilty of some Imperfections, of which the most Perfect can't be free in this transitory Life, that it is ungenerous to asperse his Sacred Ashes with it, and to go to look for him in the Tomb where he reposes, to load him with unjust Reproaches. But for his immortal Soul, she is little sensible of it in the Kingdom of Glory, which she enjoys with her Divine Master, who has been Partaker of his Sufferings upon Earth: Reign there, O Glorious CHARLES, 'till we thy faithful Subjects, impartial Admirers of thy Holiness, Magnanimity, and inimitable Patience, having payed the last Tribute to Nature, and freed from the Rags of our Mortality, might be thought worthy of being Partakers of the same Eternal Happiness. Thy Sufferings are still fresh in our Memory, and following thy Example, we pray for thy Murderers in the Annual Attonement we make for the heinous Crime committed on thy Sacred Person.

F I N I S.



(R)

3 JU 53

